REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 to 22 remain in this application. Claims 23 to 32 have been canceled. Claims 1, 14, 15, 21 have been amended.

The claims not meeting the requirements of group I have been cancelled.

Basis for most claim amendments is self-evident.

Claims 1, 9 and 12 to 18 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, indefinite. Applicants are uncertain of the reason that, for example, claim 9 was named in this rejection. Regardless, Applicants are clear on the Examiner's position regarding the term "heterocyclic". In response, Applicants have amended the claims to include a more specific definition of the term heterocyclic and ask reconsideration of this rejection.

Applicants have not addressed the terms "amide" and "ester" by amendment. Referring to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the terms "amide" and "ester"are not used in an exclusively chemical sense, in other words these terms are not used with only their chemical limitations. The terms are used in the context of "amides" and "esters" that are the pharmaceutically acceptable masking groups or protecting groups that a person skilled in the art might be expect to find on a drug fit for human consumption. Notably and appropriately, the Examiner was not offended by the breadth of the terms "pharmaceutically acceptable salt", because not just any salt is referred to. Applicants are using "ester" or "amide" in the same sense. Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1, 2, 8, 10-16, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Neuenschwander et al. The definition of Z has been amended to exclude a bridged bicyclic group. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 8, 10-16, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Connor. Applicants request reconsideration. Very roughly stated Connor's R_c equivalent group is -N-alkyl-N(diamine or cyclic) or -alkyl-N-alkyl-N(diamine or cyclic). In the Connor disclosure this follows from the general structure on page 6 and the definition of R_7 on the following page. The example in question on page 24 falls into the first group. Respectfully, Applicants' R_c does not cover these groups or the exemplified compound. R_c is –WZ. In the structurally closest portion of Applicants' genus to the compounds of Connor, W might be $-N(R_{10})-$ and Z might be heterocycle or amine, but there is no provision for the alkyl spacer of Connor. The fact that a heterocyclic ring can be formed on R_7 of Connor is conceded.

Claims 1, 2, 8, 10, 12 and 26 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Agarwal et al. Phenyl is deleted from the definition of Z'. Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1, 8, 10, 12-16, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Joshi et al. If all of the combinations of the stated substituents are taken into account there are 12 combinations including R=H and R1=H. Yet how is a person reading the full sentence supposed to interpret the phrase "New F-contg. Indoles" stated immediately in front of the statement of allowed combinations. Respectfully, if it is read in its ordinary meaning, non-F containing compounds are disallowed by the terms of the description.

Claims 1, 2, 8-16, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious in view of Neuenschwander et al. In view of the arguments made above, Applicants request reconsideration.

Claims 1, 2, 8-16, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as obvious in view of Connor. R7 must be –alkyl-NR10R11. The Examiner's description of R7 as NR10R11 is incomplete. Applicants' claims do not include this alkyl spacer. Reconsideration is requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
John Harbour
Reg. No. 31,365

Johnson & Johnson
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003
(732) 524-2169
Dated: May 1, 2003